



A
R E P L Y
TO THE
COUNTER-ADDRESS, &c.



[Price One Shilling.]



H. Conway (Hon. H. S.)
A

R E P L Y
TO THE
COUNTER-ADDRESS;

B E I N G

A VINDICATION of a PAMPHLET
ENTITLED, AN
ADDRESS to the PUBLIC,
on the late Dismission of a
GENERAL OFFICER.

Ultrò venis indicans te amare et ferre non posse.

TERENCE.

L O N D O N:

Printed for W. NICOLL, at the Paper Mill, in *St. Paul's*
Church Yard, M DCC LXIV.

REPLY

TO THE

UNIVERSITY

46

503



OR

GENERAL OFFICE

LONDON

A
R E P L Y
T O T H E
C O U N T E R - A D D R E S S , &c.

THOUGH in times like these, wherein objects of political disquisition are so eagerly entertained, and so universally decided on, it should seem almost superfluous to attempt an apology for addressing the public upon an open measure of government, a repetition of this trouble may however stand in need of some excuse. It may not be improper then to urge, in vindication of this reply, that I am averse to babling disputation, nor do I enter the lists through a fond desire of playing a prize before the people. The cause of government, be the ministers who they will, and their champions better armed than even my own vanity will allow me to think I am, is ever ungracious and unpopular; be the measures ever so just or so necessary, the most able *defence* meets but a sorry welcome, whilst the slightest insinuations of its adversaries, are considered as authentick proofs, and every insidious accusation receives a double weight from the malice of the prosecutor, and the disposition of the judges: Yet under these disadvantages, not indeed peculiar to the present question, or to the administration now subsisting, the Author of these sheets chearfully

B
rests

rests his cause with every impartial mind: To all such as scan the transactions of government, with a view solely to asperse them; to all whose interested views will not suffer their tongues to applaud what their hearts, however, are unwilling to condemn; to all whose passions and *affections* cloud the use of their sober judgment; to all these, I say, and many more falling within descriptions collaterally taken from these general heads, this Address is not written:—It is not written even to the Author of the Counter-Address; his reasonings, alas! have least of all been the occasion of this second printed letter; the arguments contained in what he is pleased to think an answer, I was well able to withstand, and upon which, if I had been silent, it would not have been surely from respect: But his perversions and misrepresentations of a very plain and obvious meaning ought not to go without some notice; and it is with this view, and this solely, that I am now troubling the public. The abuse too, so plentifully scattered through the several pages of his work, would in some minds have stirred emotions to which I confess myself a stranger. Detraction of this sort, the usual substitute of solid argument, I have ever considered as the sure symptom of an indefensible proposition, the noticing of which, is the likeliest way of bringing the assertion into repute. But this *abuse* it would be more unpardonable to reply to, or retort, since there is a weakness and an effeminacy in it, which seems to burlesque even calumny itself. The complexion of the malice, the feeble tone of the expression, and the passionate fondness with which the *personal* qualities of the officer in question are continually dwelt on, would almost tempt one to imagine, that this arrow came forth from a female quiver; but as it wants both the true delicacy and lively imagination which characterize a lady's pen, the attack must probably have been made from a neutral quarter,

quarter, from a being between both, neither totally male or female, whom, if naturalists were to decide on, they would most likely class him by himself; by nature maleish, by disposition female, so halting between the two, that it would very much puzzle a common observer to assign to him his true sex. The description of the hermaphrodite horse which is just brought to town, may, perhaps, not unaptly represent him; "he possesseth all the characters of both sexes, but the odd situation and transposition of the parts, appear as it were the sport of nature, and render him the greatest curiosity ever seen." But be the author who he will, to his railing I say nothing; to his reasoning, what follows.—

As to the apology he is pleased to make for undertaking the defence of his friend, viz. The clumsiness of his antagonist, I own fairly and freely, I have no such excuse in my behalf. My antagonist, the Author of the Counter-Address, if the conjecture above hinted at should in any degree be founded, is not liable to that objection. Whoever has seen the delicate structure of his frame, will never chuse out the epithet, *clumsy*, to apply to it. Leaving therefore to himself the reasons for thus taking up the cudgels, among which, perhaps, his fertile brain might suggest to him some voice speaking with Marcellus in Hamlet,

Thou art a scholar, speak to it, HORATIO;

I shall not so much as stop to return him my thanks for singling me out, or classing me with writers in the Daily Gazetteer; but as he is pleased to be metaphorical (I cannot say flowery) and to say, that I have amassed a whole nosegay of nettles, I will give him one piece of advice, whether he will take it or no, next time that he encounters so stinging an adversary to put on his gloves; or in a more simple

phrase, to make use of stronger and more substantial arguments in the next pamphlet he publishes, lest the works of his antagonist, whilst they smell sweetly to those who have any taste for flowers, should prove thorns and nettles to him, and affect his mind as real nettles (I beg pardon for so tremendous a threatening to him) would his delicate body, scratch and tear it most miserably.—I should hardly have thought it worth detaining the attention of my readers to a defence of my motto, if it had not been cited by my adversary as a compendium of gall and bitterness. ‘*Equidem ego sic existumo omnes cruciatus minores quam facinora illorum esse, sed plerique mortales post rem meminere et in hominibus impiis sceleris eorum obliti de pœnâ disferunt.*’ Though very applicable to the subject on which I was writing, it was by no means intended to run parallel in every point with the case of the officer in question; it was designed only to give some idea of the foolish lenity, with which even the justest and most necessary acts of severity are received: Be the crimes what they will, be the aggravations of offences ever so notorious, the punishment of them ever so deserved, yet the infliction of that punishment raises in some men through compassion, in others through obstinacy and perverseness, sentiments of commiseration. The idea of harshness and cruelty, from the sufferings appointed for the crime, remains long after the remembrance of the degree of guilt which was the occasion of those sufferings is totally obliterated:—This is the sense of the passage alluded to in Sallust; this it was intended to lay down as an axiom; and *therefore* intended, because so extraordinary an instance of its truth had just been given in the case now under debate.

Upon the report of the dismissal of a general officer, nothing but lamentation and woe, but complaints

plaints and upbraidings, but inflammatory accusations and aspersions against the hand imposing the disgrace, as if it was not supposed possible that the general could have merited such a dismissal. The rigour was loudly inveighed against, no room left for the least insinuation that there might be a justifiable cause for such a removal.

In this situation of things, what more natural for a dispassionate man, endeavouring to speak reason to his countrymen, than to recal their minds from what unhappily is but too customary; to suggest to them, that though practice is on their side by forgetting the crime, and remembering only the disgrace, yet there may possibly be sufficient grounds for what has thus been done. It is but a just confidence in government, to suppose that there are such grounds; and therefore, though I pretend not to assign, nor ever did assign, the reasons of the general's dismissal, yet desiring as I do to think well of the government under which I live, I conclude that they were right in what they did, though my own little experience in business may not furnish me with the causes of it. After having said this, and being taxed with recurring to a foreign language for a motto, I must own, I should not have expected to have found my antagonist citing six lines from the *Henriade* of Voltaire, the sense of which would have been more applicable to the administration of a late reign, than it can be to the present. It would not be a very pleasing question to the Author, or his friends, to enquire in what period of time the honours and offices of this kingdom were scandalously set to sale.—It is sufficient for my purpose to assert, that no such venal transactions have disgraced the reign of George the Third. With what propriety then can these lines be introduced as applicable

cable to a set of ministers, so remarkably chaste as the present, in the disposal of their employments?

Qui des Mœurs et des Loix avarès corrupteurs,
De Themis et de Mars ont vendu les honneurs.

I have already animadverted on the imbecility even of the rage of my antagonist. The 8th page of his performance affords one instance, among many others, of a most lady-like form of speaking, where, in mentioning the dismissal of a general officer, he is pleased to call it his ruin. Who would not conclude, at the first blush, that attempts had been made on the general's virtue, and that those in power had assaulted him in a most unnatural manner, or effected his *ruin* by a debauch?—It is necessary here, however, to take notice of an imputation on the Author of the Address, which will not be found warranted by any expressions in the pamphlet; 'That the general's total *ruin* was necessary, in order to give an idea of firmness and decision.' I would ask my *Honourable Answerer*, where it is that he finds so extraordinary an assertion?—Speaking indeed of the objection which might be plausibly started, to the depriving the general of his military command, and combating the opinion, that the dismissal ought to have been restrained to his civil employment; it was contended for, that the totality of it was necessary in order to its being a punishment, and a supposition was introduced, in which the taking away the civil office might have been interpreted as a relief, instead of what we are to suppose it, an evident mark of the royal displeasure:—Somewhat too was said in another part of the argument, of the necessity of a distinction between the friends and the foes of government. Much pains surely need not be spent to ascertain so self-evident a proposition, and for the truth of it, besides the appeal to daily and hourly

hourly experience, I would fain call on those who are practised in the great line of political management, I speak not now to the Author of the Counter-Address, I would ask men who are versed in political business, of what continuance would that administration be, which suffered its adherents and its adversaries to meet with the same encouragement? *Ubi malos præmia sequuntur baud quisquam fere gratuito bonus est.* This axiom carries no reflection on the slavishness or venality of mens minds, but asserts what no one, who is conversant with human nature, will be absurd enough to deny, that hopes and fears are the great incitements to action; take away these from the political as well as the moral life of man, the consequence is inevitable, you reduce him to a state of inaction, and of indifference; the fatal effects of such an indifference to the cause of any government, are too obvious to need insisting on, and can only be remedied by drawing a line between those who lend their cordial support, and such as continue obstinate and irreconcilable enemies. Shall I add too, (what some readers perhaps may term, argumentum ad hominem) that the doctrine I have been maintaining was fully countenanced by his practice, who is now universally acknowledged one of the ablest ministers this country ever had, I mean Sir Robert Walpole, who, when vilified by the counter-addressers of his days, for the dismissal of *two* general officers, answered; ‘I should be a pitiful minister, if I suffered those who are in opposition to continue in employment:’ And yet those dismissions, and some others which took place in the course of his administration, were attended with circumstances of rigour, which even the invention of my antagonist has not yet brought within the case now under consideration. But more of this in its proper place. Fortified then by the general conduct of mankind, who, eager for encouragement, naturally

turally lean to the most promising side of the question, and jealous of their competitors, would scorn to endure a preference which could not be justified by its being deserved; strengthened too, as the assertion is, by so illustrious, and I trust so convincing an example, it will not now be controverted, should I repeat, and even dwell on the necessity of a distinction to be made between the supporters of government, and those who make it their business to oppose it; and the distinction once allowed, the idea of giving to a man the choice of his disgrace, and of leaving to him that employment which is the most lucrative and the most acceptable, thus rewarding him in the midst of punishment, is too ludicrous to be maintained.

- I will not follow the Author of the Counter-Address through that detail of personality, pleasing as the theme may be to him, into which his zealous affection for the gentleman in question has betrayed him. One of the beaux esprits of the present times, has christened this regard, calling it, with a feigned concern, 'an unsuccessful passion, during the course of twenty years.' I hope, however, I shall stand excused, if not seeing through the medium of so high wrought a partiality, I forbear entering upon those traits of the gentleman's character, which well enough become the notice of the lover. I shall not, I trust, be expected to expatiate on the respectful silence he has observed, on the calmness and decency of his resignation, the submission with which he received the notice of his removal, on the sharp campaign he has gone through, the many *pitched* battles he has been concerned in, the manner of his walking up to the mouth of a cannon, as pourtrayed by George Stanhope.—These and many other such interesting particulars, though well enough suited to the diary of his very loving defender, will not, I'm afraid, be
con-

considered as important objects of the public attention: To these my present view is directed. Every personal consideration apart, I apply myself to this transaction, as to a measure of government; and forgetting my antagonist's regard for the object of the dismissal on the one hand, and every pique and prepossession against him on the other; it remains now to see whether the ground on which this matter was argued in the Address, is defensible or no; that is the sole issue to be tried, and let the impartial public be my jury. Upon the plan just proposed, it would be foreign to our purpose to enter on an examination of his military conduct; such an enquiry could only be useful, if the professed design of these sheets was to point out the *reasons* and *causes* of this dismissal: No such enquiry has yet been instituted, no such design set on foot, much less has it been ever avowed, (notwithstanding the pretended quotations from the Address) that the general's conduct in parliament was the cause of his disgrace.

The author of these Essays has too much confidence in the government, whose common protection he enjoys, and too moderate an opinion of his own sagacity and penetration, to take upon himself to assign the foundations of measures which he believes are right, though he is unable to account for them; he thinks too respectfully of the constitution of his country, and too honourably of the peoples representatives, ever to insinuate, that they are to be frightened into a submission by the hand of power. Such slavish tenets as these he utterly disclaims, and defies even the insidious Author of the Counter-Address, to quote a single line from his first pamphlet that can countenance such a heavy charge:—But though restrained by many reasons, some of them too of the most cogent kind, from entering into a detail of what the

C

general

general *has done*, one may just cursorily observe what it is he has *not* done. He has not (and I can now give the public the *biggest authority for this assertion, the Counter-Address, page 6.*) *atchieved any action of remarkable eclat, or performed alone any action of signal utility to his country*: He did not dissent from the council of war on the expedition to Rochefort: He did *not*, tired of the routine of picket duty, and the parade of lucrative German campaigns, leave his friends and family and fly to a new scene of action, where the rules and postures of Bland's discipline were unheard of and unexperienced, where the service was sharp and painful, dangers frequent and unavoidable, and the very climate an alarming enemy. What this officer did not do, recalls to my mind the gallant feats of our American Scipio, whose hand laid on the table a law providing most effectually for the internal defence of his country at home, and abroad signed the capitulation of the great citadel of North America, a conquest big with the most solid advantages to Great Britain. He is now, thanks to the royal discernment! not pining in disgrace, not complaining of hardships, but sharing liberally the rewards of his signal services. I speak not now the language of adulation, this is no hired hackneyed praise; it is the genuine offspring of a heart warmed with the sense of his deserts, and rejoicing in the testimony which is so universally given of them.—But to return: After what has been already said, it may be needless to go into a formal refutation of every assertion which is made, that the Author of the Address has imputed the general's dismissal to his conduct in parliament, and yet the passing them over without notice, might be interpreted by some zealots, as a confession of the charge: Thus page 8. *We have seen it avowed in print, (says he) that total ruin was to be the portion of members of*
par-

parliament who oppose administration; and p. 9. For what is the context a general officer is dismissed for, his behaviour in parliament, in a free parliament? (So this daring author declares.) Daring as I may be, in the opinion of the Author of the Counter-Address, I am not yet arrived to that pitch of confidence, as to palm declarations and assertions on printed books, which are so easily had recourse to: I can easily conceive, why my adversary is so desirous of representing to the public, that I have assigned the reason of the general's dismissal; his very parenthesis betrays it, (we shall perhaps hear what the parliament, next winter, thinks of his assertion :) But in what page of the Address, can he find the declaration he contends for; so far from avowing the cause to have been the general's conduct in parliament, that I have expressly entered my caveat, in the 29th page of that pamphlet, against assigning any reason at all. These are my very words. I shall not take upon myself, to assign any reason at all for the dismissal now in question.

The enemies of government, from their ignorance or their malice, or, perhaps, from a compound of both, did not fail upon the first intimation of the dismissal, to pronounce every where dogmatically, that the measure was owing to his behaviour in parliament; and then, as mad-men are said to reason plausibly upon very wrong principles, assuming the foundation which they themselves had laid, they passionately exclaim against the tyranny of the proceeding, charging their adversaries with the tenets they had just put into their mouths, and drawing conclusions from premises which had no where their existence, but in the wild rage and disappointment of the embittered opponents of administration.

This being the case, though the Author of the Address every where disclaimed his knowledge of

the *causes* of the general's dismissal, and would have thought it both useless and impertinent to have troubled the public with his conjectures, especially where he had so little to direct his opinion, yet in the discussion of such a question, it came naturally in his way to animadvert on a report which had been so industriously propagated, and which, unhappily coinciding with the acrimony of many tempers, was the more likely to gain credit. It was unavoidable for him, in his argument, not to observe upon these insinuations, and which, the more effectually to destroy it, was not the less necessary to combat. Whoever thinks it worth their while to peruse the Address, will there find, indeed, the supposition made, (expressly in compliance with the daily rumours thrown out by Opposition of its truth) that the conduct in parliament was the cause of the inflicted disgrace; he will find the matter argued upon that supposition, and the examples of preceding times cited; but he will no where trace the least marks of any declaration, that this really *was* the cause, much less will he be able to point out any assertions concerning the methods to be used for rendering parliaments subservient. Let such prostitute doctrines as these, remain to be avowed and defended by those ministers, whose long continuance in power might well enough be accounted for, from the corrupt systems they had established, and the total extinction of which is the most serious, though secret, quarrel they have with the government at present.

The Author of the Address, vainly or weakly enough, perhaps, was willing to meet the enemy upon the ground which they had chosen; and for argument's sake, supposing, what in fact he is far from admitting, that the general was deprived of his employments, civil and military, upon account of his behaviour in parliament, he undertook to shew,
upon

upon their own state of his conduct compared with that which can be authentically vouched, that much might be said upon this question in defence of administration.

Before I dismiss this head, I would just hint, in answer to the threat of bringing this transaction under the cognizance of parliament, that should that ever be the case, I doubt not but that august assembly, ready as they are to vindicate the rights of those whom they represent, will likewise *remember*, to render unto *Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's*; they will no more encroach on the prerogative of the crown, than they would betray the liberties of their fellow subjects.

The 10th page of the Counter-Address contains a singular instance of the impartiality and unbiassed disposition of its author, in the degree of credit he gives to the report, that a noble Lord carried into the closet, a list of sixteen officers whose removal he advised; it may not be amiss to observe how implicitly he believes every report, even the most scandalous, which favours the cause of opposition, and how hard he is of belief, even of the greatest probabilities, when they affect the dear object of his affections. In order to do this effectually, compare page 10, where you find him swallowing down, very glibly, the report of the proposed removal of fifteen officers, with page 34, where he says; *As for that mob appendix of its being given out, that the general had undertaken to lead the opposition, I question whether even the gazetteers of the minority went so far, as to make such an assertion to any compeer in the majority.*

The intent of the invidious insinuation, with regard to the removal of the fifteen officers, is too obvious to need insisting on. What, is this the last
chari-

charitable effort of a dying party, to endeavour to infuse into the minds of those officers who are in parliament, and have hitherto appeared on the side of government, a jealousy of the terms on which they stand with the ministry. Are they beating up for volunteers in the cause of the dismissed general, and having no *present* pay to give, but only good quarters to *promise*, would they alarm their fears, since they cannot cherish their hopes. I would ask any unprejudiced man, what sort of language this is? Is not this intimidating men to tell them that they too are in the black list, and to lay before them round assertions, that their dismissal was intended, though it did not take place: If the advocates in the cause of government allowed themselves such liberties, they would long ago have been overwhelmed with remonstrances against despotism. But in opposition, as in jesuitism, the end sanctifies the means; the doctrine, it seems, of *future* rewards and punishments may be eagerly embraced by our free-thinkers in politicks, whilst every allurement that is *present* stands exploded from their creed.

In the eleventh page of the elaborate performance I am considering, among other facetious reasons which he condescends to give, why there cannot be any design of new-modeling the army; The nation (says he) is united to a man, jacobitism is extinguished, *Jacobites pardoned and received into favour*. Why, surely my antagonist must be some old *Walpolian*, who has revived the constant court cant during Sir Robert's administration: Every man in opposition was then set down a jacobite: An old lady of my acquaintance, who just remembers some of the names of those who were at the tail of the adverse party to Lord Orford's ministry, and many of whom are now in the greatest employ-
ments

ments of the government, can scarcely forbear, at the mention of their names, though known to be zealous whigs, to brand them with the name of jacobites. "I am sure," she will now and then very passionately exclaim, "they were always reckoned so in Sir Robert's time." The case is just the same with the *young men* now in opposition, notwithstanding the notoriety of the whig principles of many who now form the administration, of as whiggish names and hearts as N——e or D——e can pretend to be; yet the word is given—It is a Tory ministry; and those who speak less favourable, are not scrupulous to declare that they are most of them *converted*, our Author adds *pardoned* jacobites.

The most wonderful conversion I ever heard or read of, is that of the London Evening-Post, whose papers are regularly stuffed, three times every week, with elogiums on the whigs and declamations against jacobitism; in this, unfortunately indeed, giving the lye to our Author's assertion, that jacobitism is extinguished; as it can never be imagined that so doughty a champion would wage mortal battle with an enemy already annihilated. But I forbear pressing my opponent on a prejudice which may possibly run in his blood; and the rather, as hereditary evils are of all others the most obstinate in their nature, and the least easy to be removed; I pass on, therefore, to that passage in which he is so good as to explain what it is probable I alluded to, when I asserted that the dismissal was not unprecedented. Whenever I want an interpreter, I shall not think of applying to the penman of the Counter-Address; he has fallen so very short, whether wilfully or not I cannot determine, of what I meant to insinuate: It is true, indeed, that I did allude to the cases of Lord Cobham, the Duke of Bolton, and Lord Westmorland, in the late reign,
not

not forgetting (which our Author has omitted) the additional instances of the two dismissions of the Dukes of Argyle and of Marlborough: Nor would I willingly forget who was prime minister at the time when the three first dismissions were advised; and though I will even allow that there is a wide and material difference between the examples just mentioned, and the case of the officer now in question, the argument, I am convinced, will conclude upon the comparison very forcibly in favour of the present administration. There was a tenor of conduct in the persons dismissed, a strain of rigour in the circumstances of the dismissal, which cannot be applicable to what we are now considering: But it did not suit my opponent's purpose to state things as they were; he recurs therefore to the common artifice, of representing them as he would have them: It was his business, perhaps too it might concern his *personal* honour and credit, to soften down and alleviate the dismissal of a former reign, and to blazon forth in all its terrors the disgrace lately inflicted. With what other view could he assert, speaking of Lord Cobham, &c. that they were engaged in the most offensive and declared opposition against the court, when the very reverse of all this is generally allowed to have been the fact. Lord Cobham had never dissented from the court but in one single instance; the question was, I think, the motion for an inquiry into the conduct of the South-Sea scheme; and in this, he was joined by some of the most zealous and determined advocates of government, particularly, as I remember, the Lords Scarborough and Scarisdale: Lord Westmorland had actually voted for the general excise, not a very popular, or at that time thought a very prudent measure. It is true, indeed, that he *once* divided against the court (the particular instance is not now present to my recollection) and

for that single vote he was actually dismissed, notwithstanding he had given, but nine months before, a very considerable sum of money for the command of which he was deprived, and had never received a single shilling, nor could ever get it afterwards, of pay, during the time he was really in possession.

Whoever recollects the times I am now speaking of, will readily agree with me in the account I have been giving. In whose favor then is the parallel? are they most to blame who dismissed general officers for their votes in parliament (a reason expressly avowed and declared by the premier himself) who, so far from being in opposition, had concurred with the court much oftener than they had dissented from it; so far from allowing themselves an intemperance of language and behaviour in opposition to government, that they had contributed to its support, upon a measure execrated by three fourths of the common people of this kingdom; and one of whom had, besides the title to service and bravery, the additional claim of having purchased the command of which he was afterwards deprived? Or can it be thought a more rigorous proceeding, to turn out (for what reason has never been declared) a general officer who was openly in opposition? I say, openly, notwithstanding the proofs which his puny champion has promised to produce, that he was not; and from a command too, which, I will venture to say, he never purchased? And with what soundness of conclusion is the present case declared, as it is, with much peremptoriness, unprecedented with regard to the officer in question?

Enough, I trust, has been said, to point out the distinction of the several instances mentioned, and

to ascertain very clearly which administration is the most exempt from any merited imputations, without having recourse to the two dismissions of the Duke of Argyle, and the removal of the Duke of Marlborough; each of whom have a feature in them, by my antagonist's own confession, not to be paralleled in the case which he has undertaken to support: I mean the plea of uncommon service, attended with a success scarcely to be equalled in the annals of this or any other country.

I have before mentioned a circumstance attending the dismissions of the late reign, which will not, I am sure they ought not to be laid to the charge of this in question, the reasons given for such dismissal: And yet the confident writer I am answering asserts, without hesitation, that the minister never presumed, never dared to acknowledge that they were removed for parliamentary conduct. Must I again sound in his ears the words once already quoted; "I should be a pitiful minister, if I suffered those who are in opposition to continue in employment?" or will he still contend that this is not a formal acknowledgment, for a gentleman who picques himself upon truth and fair representation?

A detection in the following falsehoods may, perhaps, seem fully sufficient.

I. That the dismissions in the late reign, are by no means applicable to the case now under consideration.

II. That the general officers who were dismissed in the late reign, were violent and intemperate in opposition.

III. That

III. That the minister, by whose advice they were dismissed, never owned that they were dismissed for their conduct in parliament. And to crown the whole, as a corollary to these extraordinary problems :

IV. That the general, who is the occasion of this dispute, never was in opposition.

I am well aware, as to this last, that my quibbling opponent may plausibly put a question, and ask, with some shew of seeming triumph, Pray how and when was the general detected in opposition? To which I answer, The detection lies in the mind and conscience of every man who will recall to his memory the late transactions.—Suppose a man, upon a question of mere precedence, between the receiving a message from the crown, and a pretended trump'd up complaint of violated privilege, to give his voice and speak in favor of the latter, and would such a man be called an advocate for that government, whose message he has thus postponed? Suppose a man, on the first day of a session of parliament, in a question, wherein even the shadow of liberty could not be urged in defence of the vote given, placed himself under the banner of those who openly avowed an opposition to the ministry, would he be excepted from the general class, and be stiled a friend to that ministry, which he had repeatedly voted against on a variety of subjects, arraigned them of ignorance and inability, and betrayed a petulance in his language, which some of the most determined enemies of government would not have allowed themselves in the use of? Leaving then the reconciling such paradoxes to my fanciful antagonist, I would only just remind him, amid the complaints he has vented of the abuse scattered throughout my pam-

phlet, that even admitting the fact as he has stated it, it would have become him to have set me a better example in his own productions. Fool and liar are some of the softest appellations he has honoured me with; and by way of addition, in the 13th page, What does falsehoods cost a man who writes for pay? I would picque my Author's vanity a little, by observing to him that this is no new calumny. Every writer who has appeared on the side of government, from those who were paid and pensioned by *Sir Robert Walpole*, down to the conclusion of the last reign, has been constantly charged with the most abject degree of venality and prostitution.

For my own part, conscious as I am of its futility, I am pleased with the accusation in one sense, as an indubitable symptom, that whatever I may be as a man, as a writer however I have got the victory over my opponent. The argument must surely fail him, when he quits the cause of his beloved friend, and flies to personality as a refuge.

But to say somewhat in his own way, Is it the government *only* that can *pay* authors, or must every writer, like every voter in opposition, be a patriot, and plead the cause of his country without any mercenary views? But perhaps, through deficiency of real cash, promises are the current coin, which is plentifully lavished as an encouragement to bespatter those in power; to the men at ease in their fortunes, who, as they write not from necessity, might well enough be supposed to turn scribblers from opinion; yet even to these, I would fain ask, whether there may not be a settled price? That every man has his price, was a ministerial maxim, upon which a very long continuance in power seems principally to have been founded. I do

do not pretend to any extraordinary degree of accuracy in my distinctions, but I own freely, I cannot discern any material difference between the man (if any one so corrupted there be) who takes so many pieces of lawful money of Great Britain for publishing a pamphlet, and him who, though he writes with a silver standish before him, is to have such a great office himself, such a reversion for his nephew, such a lieutenancy for his cousin, upon the success of those whose cause he means to defend. In short, the distance of the reward abates nothing from the venality of the principle.—Those imputations then may be well omitted, which are equally capable of being retorted.

I should go on to take notice how extremely personal he grows in the prosecution of his subject, how pathetically he dwells on the ingenuous modesty of the general, on his extraordinary humility, on the twenty-seven years that he served, the six regular battles he was engaged in, besides many bye battles or smaller actions, the heroes under whom he was formed, and the decorum which has graced every period of his fortune, if I did not recollect the unhappy situation of my Author, *C'est une affaire du cœur*: 'Tis his *first* love who has been so barbarously used, and all too, for *voting on a constitutional point against administration*. Was it a constitutional point to vote that Mr. Wilkes's complaint, of what he called a breach of privilege (though it is plain, by the declaration of both houses, that he was not intitled to privilege in that case) should be received and attended to, before a solemn message from the crown? Was it a constitutional point to vote that an address should be presented for a copy of the warrant, when the parties accused were necessarily obliged to produce those warrants in their defence, as the authority on
which

which they acted? Was it a constitutional point to vote that the warrants were illegal, and then, very consistently, when a cure was offered for the evil which had been painted in such terrible colours, to neglect the application of the remedy? In answer to the Author only, If general warrants are, indeed, so radically and alarmingly dangerous to liberty, why not thankfully lay hold on a bill which was framed to suppress them. Are the liberties of this country so interwoven with the censure and condemnation of particular men, that they are to be left open and unguarded, unless these can be stigmatized and branded? Is that man to be considered as a martyr to freedom and to conscience, who is content to leave his countrymen exposed, unless his revenge be first satisfied; who refuses to concur with any provisions for their relief, unless two victims are offered up to appease the manes of his indignation? Words surely will cease to stand as marks and signs of things, if, to a conduct like this, patriotism and liberty be applied.

But to proceed; the 16th page of the Counter-Address sets out with half a quotation from the pamphlet he is answering, an application of it, to what he insists upon it *I ought to mean*, and an inference drawn from the interpretation, which he himself has invented. *Dismissions in general are sanctified by custom, though state physicians have considered them as a kind of extraordinary remedy, &c.* Thus the quotation which he asserts, I must mean to apply to the case of the general. If he would have had the fairness and ingenuity to have considered my words as they really stood, he would have found the passage as follows: With respect to dismissions in general, they are so sanctified by custom, even by the constant custom of those who, while in power, practised them without remorse,

3

though

though they are now condemning them without measure, that I could scarce hope for the publick attention were I to enlarge on them in the light of hardships, but the reason of the omission is very obvious: The imputing dismissions to *former* administrations, could not so cleverly suit the purpose of a patriot who was so bitterly exclaiming against them at present. Besides that, had he suffered himself to transcribe my words as they stand printed, there would have been an end of all that twisting and turning, by which he very ingeniously makes believe that I was speaking of the general's dismissal in the medical allusion there made use of. But let any man of common sense and candour peruse the passage, and he will soon detect the artifice: Who are the state physicians there spoken of? Can they be any other than those by whose custom dismissions are sanctified, who, while in power, practised them without remorse, though they now condemn them without measure? These are the state quacks, the *Highb German Doctors*, who bid you beware of the poisons of others only in order to be paid for instilling into you their own. These are they, who, unskilful in the regular treatment of patients, and scorning to proceed in the method prescribed by the Dispensary, are ever having recourse to pills and nostrums; those violent remedies which patch up the constitution, whilst they destroy the stamina of the diseased: My adversary will surely think that I must have had a better attention to my *pay* than to think of libelling my patrons.

The description I was giving can never be applicable to those who adhere to the college method of practice, and who, if ever they cut off an unsound limb, 'tis only ne pars sincera trahatur. It must and does relate to those who, in the late reign, so
often

often advised what they are now so loud in condemning; and if the effects of this violence were metaphorically marked out, the design of it is a plain one, to set in a glaring point of view the consequences of the conduct: Their intention in proceeding to such extremities, not an approbation of it, is set before the public.

The Author of these sheets utterly disclaims the idea that members are to be intimidated. What he asserts, and what is justified by fact is, that in former reigns, and in former parliaments, members *have been* intimidated by dismissions; and that they were designed so to be, will not seem too bold an assertion, when it is recollected, that the ministers who advised their disgrace, did not scruple to avow, that the cause of such removal was the conduct in parliament. But how is that in the least applicable to the present administration? Have they assigned the reason for the dismissal now in question? Have they professed a design to frighten members into submission? With what conclusion of sound reasoning then can it be asserted, that the description of the operation of dismissions, affects the present parliament.

I have dwelt the longer on this subject, because my opponent, sensible where the argument pinched, has been industrious to shift off from the new patriots, but *old* ministers, a tenor of conduct which redounded so little to their credit; and the abhorrence of which was not lessened by the readiness with which they owned it: Away, then, with the pathetic lamentations and complaints of the contemptuous style of my Address; with the envenomed application to the fifteen officers, whom I suppose, by his putting into a black list, he vainly thinks

thinks to drive into opposition, by an appeal to their resentments.

As a specimen of the accuracy of his comparisons, and the justness of his similitudes, hear him running a parallel between the general now in question and general Wolfe, whom he undertakes very modestly to assert, that I should have stigmatized had he been alive.——His logic is of a curious kind. Because I insinuated that one general who was in parliament, might probably owe his rise, in some measure, to family alliance and parliamentary connections; and which I still think very possible, notwithstanding he served in two wars and a rebellion (for he rose under ministers who promised and threatned members of former parliaments) therefore had general Wolfe (who was *not* in parliament, and who *never* rose by *parliamentary* interest) been living, I should have given him little quarter. But this imputation, as well as that of having laid down as a position, that time-serving in parliament, ought to be the great rule of judging of an officer's merit, sufficiently answer themselves by being mentioned: Nor is he more fortunate in his references, than we have just proved him in his quotation. He desires the Red Book to be examined, in order to invalidate my assertion, that civil employments of eminence are acquired by greater industry, and more difficult to be obtained than military; and that if the progress in the former is more rapid, it is the sure mark of uncommon genius and proficiency. In answer to which, I would only observe, that in spite of particular exceptions, the general doctrine may be a true one; and if the particular instance he has referred to, derogates from the axiom, I would ask him, who is to blame? If the Court-Calendar is an evidence, that preferment is not the reward of un-

E

common

common genius and proficiency in the civil and military lines, to whom is that scandal owing, but to those who distributed the emoluments? Who is it, think you, that has preferred nine tenths of those whose names are now seen in the Red book? Let him the next time he shoots an arrow over the house, take care not to slay his brother.

I am now got to the 19th page only of the Counter-Address, and to about the two and fortieth misrepresentation. Aware, probably, that I would never speak the language he would have me, he goes a surer way to work, and freely puts my name to what it is his pleasure I should say: the next objection raised, is to the assertion, 'that the army cannot but think, that the general should have given his assistance to government, if he expected their support,' and he immediately betakes himself to what he all has along supposed, that the general was dismissed for the single vote he gave relating to the warrants. I, on the contrary, pretend to assign no reasons for the dismissal, much less could I think that the ministry would rest their cause on one single vote, when the totality of his opposition might be so truly pleaded. Be that as it may, the assertion remains in its full force. The doctrine is a general one, and cannot be impeached by a reference to this particular case; every officer who bears the King's commission, *ought* to assist government; this not only the army, but every sober citizen has a right to expect. The measures and extent of that assistance may be dispensed with, by particular instances under the violence of despotism, in illegal, unconstitutional acts; but the position remains a true one, and if an application be insisted on, I will put a quere to an ingenuous mind, which may set this matter in its full light. Is it probable, that government should be *always* so adverse to the true interests

rests of those it governs? Is it so constantly at warfare with law, equity, and conscience, that an honest man, who means to do his duty, must throw himself *wholly* into opposition to it? What then can the civil or military well-wisher to his country think, when he sees a gentleman very high in his profession, and under particular obligations to his sovereign, acting nine times in ten, in direct opposition to the servants of the crown? Will he not be tempted to imagine, that he sometimes acts for wrath, as well as for conscience sake? And will he not subscribe to the opinion, that there should be a reciprocity of protection and support between the *prince* and the subject? This is a bargain which is so far from threatening slavery, that it is the only way to be truly free: Take away the protection of the Prince, and we become a disorderly multitude, without confidence, without weight, without restraints of any kind; take away the support of the subject, and it becomes the fable of the belly and the members. The happiness of individuals, and the prosperity of the nation, depend on the firmest union; but my Author has settled his hypothesis, and on he goes, without any regard either to text or context.

Among the sentiments which, I thought it probable the officers in the army might have on this dismissal, I mentioned the idea of retaliation; they might imagine, that as the general went out of his way, and of his profession, to perplex and harass the King's servants, it is no wonder that retaliation might in some sort take place; a very natural, and a very innocent supposition, when understood to be applicable to the *whole* conduct without doors, as well as within, of the general, and not to that particular part of it which is singled out by my antagonist. Indeed whoever reads his performance alone, would be tempted to conclude, that I had advanced

a proposition of a very dangerous nature; it has quite lost him his temper, he falls into an extravagance of passion, the effects of which, if continued in, can be little less than fatal to the delicate habit of his nerves: Yet so tender are even his resentments, so soft and gentle his upbraidings, that all he can work himself up to, is, to compare me to a fawning court chaplain. In answer to his questions concerning a man's going out of his way, I will only tell him, that constant declared enmity to administration, declared by the least equivocal of all signs, a uniform system of conduct, cannot be in the way of a man, who has only conscience to plead. The same account might, perhaps, be given of this matter, which Falstaff renders, in the play, of Rebellion:

Opposition lay in his way, and he found it.

Our Author would probably wish the present ministers to be so pitiful, as to reward and encourage men for setting them at defiance; to promote them for calling them ignorant and unable; to give them their favourite object, the Staff, the regiment of Blues, or of Artillery, for siding, on the most indifferent occasions, with their determined adversaries. This mode of conduct would, I trust, have been the only one that could have met with approbation, as it would have effectually secured them the contempt of their friends, and bid fair for encreasing the number of their enemies.

Page 24. I meet with the following words, 'A great minister would have confuted his opponent, with proofs of knowledge and talents:' But what confutation does a mere random charge (totally destitute of any shadow of proof) of ignorance and inability deserve? What tokens of knowledge and talents could be wanting after the ninth of last March, a day on which the opposers were struck dumb, when,

when, after all their boasted efforts, after all their calumniating charges, they found themselves forced to join in the unwilling commendation of talents, which their low industry had been at work all the winter to depreciate? The opposition of the Counter-Address, like that of the general on whose behalf it is written, is *total*. There is hardly a single paragraph but what he nibbles and bites at.

The conclusion I drew from the sentiments of the army, I find, is by no means easily digested: I observed, that, with regard to military men, whenever they incur the displeasure of their master, in matters wholly foreign to the military, they will be so far from making a cause commune, or from applying it to themselves as any mark of disgrace, that it will rather prove a means of keeping them more closely attached to the respective businesses before them. I am well aware of the reason which makes him so inveterate against the conclusion just mentioned; it saps the very foundation of his defence, which, amongst many other laudable motives, had certainly in its contemplation, the uniting the officers in general, but particularly those in parliament, as one man, to complain and inveigh against the late dismissal; and for fear his insinuation, of the intended removal of the fifteen, should not meet with all that credit which he wished, he forbears addressing himself to their passions, and commences logician. The army, says he, do think themselves aggrieved, because the general was dismissed for nothing relating to his profession: Even closing with him for the sake of argument, though I can by no means admit the assertion in its full force, as I neither know, nor pretend to assign, the reason for which he was dismissed, and consequently, will not point out any part of his conduct, either civil or military, as a subject on which I can be bold enough to say, that he
was

was *not* dismissed ; yet, upon the footing he states it, with what colour or propriety can the officers of the army resent, as a discouragement and an injury to their profession, a disgrace inflicted on an individual, for a system of conduct in which, upon my Opponent's own supposition, he did not act, and consequently could not incur his master's displeasure, as a soldier ? Those officers, surely, must be very ripe for murmuring, who can think themselves aggrieved, because a man has suffered in circumstances, which it is morally impossible they can ever be placed in. What standard would my Author chuse for the continuance of officers ? Is mere length of service to supercede every other necessity ? By what tenure does he think that commissions should be held ; not I hope by the pleasure, and at the will of the officers who enjoy them ? Is he really so wedded to his military friend, as to bring himself to be of opinion, that councils of officers alone ought to have the power of dismissal ? Is he so dissatisfied with the form of government, under which he now lives, as to wish to take from his sovereign, the power of appointing or dismissing the officers of the army ? Or is the service of the crown such an abject slavery, that conscience and emolument are things in themselves incompatible ? Is it only the service of this master that he objects to ? But what of those who held the great offices of state in former reigns, were these all just, all honourable men, though loaded with the favours and great employments of the crown ? Or does he hold instantaneous conversion, and that a wicked blundering statesman becomes an uncorrupt disinterested patriot, by bellowing against the court ? What a pretty string of quips and quiddities has my delicate adversary introduced ? *To serve their King and country is not enough, they must serve ministers also ; the only security of honours, is the forfeiture of honours.* Is it, I would ask, from the depth

depth of his ignorance, or of his experience, that he speaks thus of courts and ministers? Is patriotism perfect freedom; and are heat and zeal, malice and virulence, perfidy and ingratitude, confined only to one side of the question? Whoever dips in party, cannot say to himself, Hitherto will I go, and no farther; some few of the leaders, indeed, may stop at the gap, before they think of trespassing, but the herd jump blindly through, directed by the bell-weather. It is really astonishing, that at a time when moderate men had flattered themselves with the hopes of the total extinction of party, there should still be such perturbed spirits, as to wish to revive those odious distinctions among us, which have abated so much of the outward splendor of these kingdoms, as well as of their internal felicity: Not content with the standing dishes of Whig and Tory, the word Jacobite is introduced, and I have already accounted for the Author's partiality to this denomination; the thing is exploded: Away then with the name.

No man, says he, but a Jacobite can wish to see an *extension* of the prerogative: But what is it I have been contending for, that the King should enjoy in the state, what every private individual possesses in his own family; the right of appointing and dismissing the persons by whom he chuses to be served. If this were a *new* proposition, unheard of even till to-day, is there any thing preposterous and unreasonable in it? But is it an *extension* of the prerogative? Have not his Majesty's royal ancestors enjoyed this privilege for ages, in its fullest extent, and have not some of the most forward patriots of this hour, been the men who both advised and avowed the exertion of this privilege? I would remind my readers, that an *extension* of the prerogative, is not now the extreme which we have the most reason to be afraid of; those who would lessen and cramp the

known legal rights of the crown, do equal disservice to their country, and are as wide from the true spirit of its constitution, as they are, who would wish to see the increase of the sovereign's power: Those levellers who, under pretence of consulting the honour of their master, and of assisting him, are taking the most effectual methods, that he shall not be able to make any resistance to their outrages.—

Whenever the Address speaks a language unfavourable to the sentiments, and, perhaps, not easily to be answered by his antagonist, quoting the *half* only, of the paragraph, suits his purpose very well; at other times, when there is a possibility of distorting the sentence to some very strained meaning, the plain and obvious sense is immediately foregone, and an interpretation introduced, in order to give to his argument some colour and plausibility: Thus p. 28, after citing from the Address the following words, "I do know that, altogether, he has received much public money, and I have no room to doubt (as the greatest part of it was given under his Grace's administration) that an equal service was performed;" he adds, *that if this paragraph has any meaning, it implies, that the Duke of N—— paid the general for his behaviour in parliament*: but had he been pleased to have attended to the argument, which he has thought it worth his while to misrepresent, he could not have allowed himself an assertion of this kind.

In the consideration of that part of the subject, which enquired what injury had been done to the general as an individual, though no writ of damages has issued, it was not surely a very unnatural question to ask, What has the general done, that gives him a right to the *continuance* of his employments? Has he performed any signal service to his country?

try? Have the parliament voted him their thanks for any particular exertion of his military skill and prowess? The result of this enquiry produced an assertion, or rather a belief, that if the accounts, debtor and creditor, were fairly settled between the general and the public, the latter would not be found to be much in debt. Let the Address speak for itself; the words are as follow: *Besides, what soldier ever served for pay, and yet even in point of fortune, upon casting up the bill, will the public be found in the general's debt? His appointments have been very considerable for a great length of time, to which, if we add the large increase which he derived from being left Commander in chief in Germany, they could form a sum sufficient to outbalance the deservings of many military men.*

The epithet of *public*, applied to money, plainly pointed out, (if it was not expressed totidem verbis) that it meant those civil and military emoluments which he had been receiving for some years, (particularly while he was commander in chief in Germany) and should at least have secured the paragraph from the invidious turn now given it, that it was intended to describe sums of money paid for the general's behaviour in parliament. I will enter, once again, my protest against such a diffidence of the integrity of any of the people's representatives, whatever way or course the general's preferments came in, the reasoning I have just mentioned remains unimpeached. He has received much public money in the civil and military lines. What has he done for it? I answer, in my Author's words, page 7. of the Counter-Address, "he has never had the happiness of atchieving any action of remarkable eclat;" though I cannot help imagining, that my readers, who have had the patience to attend me thus far,

are fully tired by this time, and reasonably convinced of the pitiful shifts and evasions to which my Opponent has been reduced, in order to render this attack even plausible; and though the subject in itself of a serious kind, will not admit of much amusement to beguile them into a perusal of the conclusion of this dispute, yet I will flatter myself with their attention for a few pages longer. If we are to judge of our Author's religion, by the singular idea he gives us of his loyalty, we shall not doubt in the least of his being a perfect quietist; his veneration for his Prince (perhaps too for his God) will not permit him to name him. I pass over the trifling apology which he makes for the general's silence on Wilkes's affair; and his ill founded assertion, that he was often up to speak, but *never* pointed to. Such minutiae as these, coincide not with the great outline of any man's reasoning, and, whether true or false, but very trivially affect the subject in debate: I chuse, therefore, to proceed to a more capital article, the endeavouring to prove that the general was not in opposition, and in p. 33, instead of any circumstances adduced, instead of any particular reasons pointed out, he satisfies himself (how far others may take up with such sort of satisfaction I will not pretend to determine) with a dogmatical assertion, that not only from January the 16th, to February the 17th, but from November 15, to April 19, the general was not once of a different opinion from the King's servants, but on the single affair of the warrants. In answer to this, I will assert, that the general was totally in opposition; I appeal to the *first* day of the sessions for the truth of it. This single instance shall be sufficient, though some others might be mentioned, equally known and convincing to invalidate his assertion. Leaving, therefore, my antagonist to digest this conviction as he may, on which I would freely rest the merits

merits of my cause, the assistance urged to have been given in the matter of Dun, is too ridiculous to be dwelt on: I hasten, therefore, to the next particular, which smells so strongly of the cabinet, that I must not pass it unobserved. He had declared to a minister before witness, in the most express terms, that he was not, nor intended to be engaged in opposition.—For my own part, I have so little skill in state intrigues, that I cannot readily conceive, what could have occasioned such a meeting between a minister and the general, much less what could have brought him to a formal disavowal of the opposition and its adherents. I have no such enthusiastick ideas of any man's truth as to trust to his words, when they are given the lye to by his actions; a temporizing spirit may indeed for a while amuse an honest unsuspicious man by professions, but when the field is taken and the action commenced, facts are too stubborn things to be explained away by declarations.

Thus then the matter stands, with regard to the general's opposition:—His gross invectives against the minister (and which were not confined, as my Author would pretend, to the subjects of the warrants, but were very vague and unrestrained) evidently shewed his heart and intentions to be as anti-ministerial, as his frequent siding with the minority did, that he was *personally* in opposition.

I come now (and fatigued I am indeed, after wading through so much sophism) to the 37th page, where, after asserting that the plan of surprizing Rochefort, was one of the vigorous measures of that great minister Mr. Pitt, he is pleased to add, 'The patrons of our author always called that scheme one of Mr. Pitt's visions.' How insatiable

is my opponent's appetite for abuse! Not satisfied with that torrent of illiberal language against one to whose person and character he is an utter stranger, the venom of his malice extends itself to the supposed friends and protectors of his unknown entity which he has been combating. But who are my patrons? Why are his shafts directed against their blameless bosoms? Does he suspect them to be those whom he has flattered, solicited, and shamefully deserted? Is this the righteous cause of so extraordinary an indignation? And surely, undistinguishing must that fury be, which sacrifices men whose names he knows not, and charges them with opinions, which owe their existence solely to his own fancy. But who could ever call one of the noblest attempts to lower the insolence of France a vision? or treat that scheme as visionary, which was directly levelled at the total destruction of the marine of that haughty rival power?

The Author of these sheets does recollect (but not among his patrons) a noble personage, who constantly shewed great averseness to the plan, and pronounced it from the first an ideal undertaking, even though an élève of his own had a great share in directing the engineers on the expedition: But our favourite general, it seems, must be brought off at all events. He did not *command* at Rochefort. True; but the success of that attempt depended on the *second* in command: And I am afraid our Author has not got a complete list of those who have ceded with them, when he talks of Sir J—n M——t, who, upon enquiry, will be found to have divided much oftner with the minority than with the ministry. The next time he mentions his darling general's courage (I do not here speak for myself, because I have explicitly declared

clared my belief of it) I would have him, for fear of infidels, quote some more respectable authority than a jest at the Earl of C——d's Table. But to my Author's tender sensations, courage may perhaps seem a *boorish, brutal* virtue, which men must be content to share in common with lions and bears; and therefore he spoke jestingly of it. As far as my opinion may be of weight, I must own that I have ever thought it a quality in which there is more of constitution than of merit, and the want of which I would no more impute to man as a crime, than I would condemn him for the colour of his hair, or the complexion of his skin.

I will not mispend the time of my readers in dwelling upon my opponent's invective against abuse; observing only in the general, that gratitude surely should have induced him not to have spoken ill of a weapon which he had so notably handled; but railing, it seems, like some other useful servants, is immediately to be discarded when it has once served the turn.

The 43d page of the Counter-Address, is a curious specimen of the mode of reasoning which our Author adopts, and which may be the more proper to be insisted on, as it is prefaced with a vaunting defiance to his adversary's argument, and a hope that, after the Answer which he shall give to it, no one will be so audacious as to mention it for the future. As it has been speciously urged, that the general suffered for maintaining the cause of his country, in the particular instance of voting the warrants to be illegal, I ventured to refer to the general's conduct, subsequent to the transaction of that day, as to a test how far the freedom of his fellow subjects was the real motive for the vote given;

iven; and inferred, as I still think I am at liberty to do, that if he had really intended the security of his countrymen only, and not the condemnation of individuals, he would have exerted all his influence in support of the bill proposed to regulate the issuing of secretary's warrants for the future. But behold the secret betrayed. The party finding their efforts baffled, and that they could obtain no resolution condemning the warrants which *had been* issued, and which, legal or not, had been signed by almost every secretary of state since the Revolution, leave their countrymen, who just now were not thought safe a moment in their houses, without this additional security, and refuse to concur in a bill offered to be framed and modelled in the manner they should think necessary. But now, these stanch patriots, like fractious children, rage and bawl out for what their hearts are set on; and their crying is never to be stilled, unless they have the very plaything they first roared for. Is it then uncandid to assert, that the condemnation of particular men was the sole object in view? Were the liberties of this country at stake, and did they entirely depend on the passing a resolution declaring the illegality of the warrants on Tuesday; and shall the bill, which effectually provided for the security of the subject from any future sufferings by these warrants, be rejected and exploded on the Friday? Are all the dreadful apprehensions of our watchful patriots so soon subsided and vanished away? or is the bill therefore a *silly simple* one, because it had not in its contemplation the stigmatizing two men, who were fully justified in what *they* did, from the stream of precedents on their side?

But hear our Autho's apology for its being rejected. *The bill was brought in by a gentleman, whom*

whom the warm advocates for liberty, and the old friends of the house of Hanover, never peculiarly affected. Am I really awake? Do I read a printed argument against the contents of a bill, which, but three days before it was refused, was declared to be essential to the salvation of this country? And why? Not for any defect in the bill; for that they well knew might be easily amended; not for any event superceding the alledged necessity of such a law, but because it was offered to the house by a gentleman who was disliked by a set of men, *calling themselves* the Advocates of Liberty, and the old Friends of the House of Hanover. Even the boasting champions of liberty refuse to accept of *freedom* itself, unless coming to them in a channel which they think fit to approve of.

It might have become the Author of the Counter-Address, I will not say on the score of civility and good-breeding, but in point of common decency and generosity, to have forborn an insult on the character of a man scarce cold in his grave, now rendered quite incapable of answering for himself; especially too, when the charge is of the grossest kind, no less than the imputation of jacobitism and disaffection. I would remind this ungentle accuser, that they are cold friends to the house of Hanover, who so liberally scatter round them these vilifying names. But so it is; whoever differs with these presuming members of the Coterie, is sure to fall under one of the following descriptions: If a Whig, he is a Scotified Englishman; if a Tory, he is a half converted pardoned Jacobite. It is really a waste of words to contend with such adversaries. I shall therefore briefly answer what follows. *The minority suspected* the bill, because brought in by one who had defended the legality of the war-
rants.

rants. The fact being false, the suspicion would fall of course, if it, indeed, could have ever been entertained of a bill which might have been altered, and which was even offered to be altered, till it corresponded with the principle on which they were desirous it should be founded. But it seems no bill, which had not a retrospect, could be drawn to their satisfaction. Again, it is asked, How it came to be in the power of the minister not to suffer the point to be settled by bill? The reason is a very obvious one. The minority had insisted that the subject was not safe an instant, 'till they were secured from being exposed to such dangerous warrants. The ministry offered to concur in any provision, securing their fellow subjects for the future, though, at the same time, they did not see the necessity of such a measure. What was the case then, and from whom was the relief to be expected? From those who had been sounding the alarm of the imminent danger; or from those who, though not seeing the danger, would yet not withhold their concurrence? A bill is brought in, expressly laying the ax to the root of the evil complained of: The bill is rejected; and the consistent patriots lay the fault on the ministry, for not settling the provision which they themselves had declared so essentially necessary; and which, in spite of such necessity, they refused to support.

As far as this conduct is culpable, the general is to blame. It will not be a sufficient excuse to say that he was absent. His friend had given out that he voted on a point of conscience. I would ask him, since his conscientious regard to the liberties of his country carried him so far on the Friday, why did not it still urge him on the Tuesday next ensuing, to support and encourage that bill, the principle of which he alleges was the foundation of

his former opinion? This question has never yet been answered satisfactorily; when it is, my antagonist will have more reason to triumph than he has yet had any grounds for.

To sum up the whole then; if it shall appear that the arguments of the Counter-Address have been invalidated, my trouble is at an end. I seek to establish no new hypothesis, no arbitrary court doctrine, no dogmatical state novelties: My propositions are short and plain; I think too, they stand unimpeached, grounded, as they are, on that attribute of kingly dignity, which no friend to monarchy will deny, the power the Crown has of appointing or dismissing officers.

Neither the public nor the army have received any injury by this dismissal.

In the course of this Defence, no less than five capital assertions have been proved on my opponent fundamentally false. Four of which (I will not invidiously here repeat them) may be seen in page 23d; and the fifth is not less important than any, or all of the rest, the totality of the general's opposition.

I would not swell the catalogue with the number of misstated facts, which have been occasionally set right. Nor do I expect, indeed, to pay my court to some readers, by having thus shewn them how they are abused. Even those who wish well to the cause of government, are as hard to please as if we write against them. And for the rest, some favourite view crossed, the natural acrimony of their dispositions, domestic disappointments and uneasinesses, all contribute their share towards making them believe what they like. Many too, will not be at

the pains of examining the principles on which either party acts. Some think too ill of mankind, and reduce the language of all parties to one common standard, the private interest of the agents. Others again, think too well, and thus are easily duped. They trust the outward declamatory professions of liberty and public good, and hear not the still whispers. “*Summissâ quædam voce colloquuntur quorum summa est de confirmandâ sibi dominatione et delendis inimicis conjuratio.*” Amid these discouragements, the cause of truth must suffer; yet the attempt is at least a laudable one, to improve the confidence of my countrymen in the government under which they live, and to teach them, as far as conclusive reasoning can do it, that the men who pretend such an honest zeal for their welfare, are, in reality, only eager to serve their own private ends; and that their most serious thoughts of saving for the public, tend only to the making it a richer morsel for themselves to devour.

